CANUCK LAW
Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

FEBRUARY 15, 2019 BY RONNIE

AOC’s “Green New Deal”, Eco-Communism & Identity Politics

MS NOW

> Climate change • Climate change refers to long-term shifts in …

Watch on

(Ocasio-Cortez, explaining the Green New Deal)

Check out Australian YouTuber Daisy Cousens, for an interesting review on the Green New Deal. Thorough, and on point in her critique.

Newly elected US Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has announced an extremely ambitious "Green New Deal". It will not only save the world, help eco-systems, dramatically boost the US economy, phase out carbon industries, but it will provide economic security for everyone — even those not willing to work.

Of course, don't bother asking how much this will cost. The only question that matters (apparently) is the cost if nothing is done. That will be the end of the world as we know it.

Many still question this economics graduate, just because she doesn't know how economics work. But that is just being divisive.

Additionally, it will pander to every imaginable group who is oppressed. The world may be ending, but it doesn't mean we have to put aside such issues as gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, etc.…

Please don't be selfish here. Wondering about (a) your job security; (b) your lifestyle; (c) your private property; (d) your civil rights, etc are inconsequential. All that matters is saving the world.

Some may wonder what will happen if they "refuse" to go along with this massive, sweeping, government program. Afterall, many are resistant to change. But we will have to see what the penalties will be later. Perhaps some amendments will be added. Daisy Cousens (in the above video), makes the valid point that in order to see this deal go through, government force will be required.

The FAQ Section

> "What is the Green New Deal?
>
> .
>
> The Green New Deal is a 10-year plan to create a greenhouse gas neutral society that creates unprecedented levels of prosperity and wealth for all while ensuring economic and environmental justice and security.

> The Green New Deal achieves this **through a World War 2 scale mobilization that focuses the robust and creative economic engine of the United States** on reversing climate change by fully rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, restoring our natural ecosystems, dramatically expanding renewable power generation, overhauling our entire transportation system, upgrading all our buildings, jumpstarting US clean manufacturing, transforming US agriculture, and putting our nation's people to work doing what they do best: making the impossible possible."

1/ The first part says that it is to create a greenhouse gas neutral society, yet also promises unprecedented levels of wealth and prosperity.
2/ Logistical question: how do you ensure economic justice when implementing such a drastic plan? It sounds expensive.
3/ So fighting climate change is like fighting Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan? Okay.
4/ To dramatically expand renewable power, wouldn't that involve developing on those lands you want to restore?
5/ Upgrade all buildings? Does that include all homes? How is such a thing possible, and

will people be put up in hotels while their homes are being upgraded?
6/ Jumpstarting US clean manufacturing? Will private or public funds be poured into that? Also, won't you also be putting a lot of other people out of work? Look at Ontario or BC to see how those "clean initiatives" have played out.
7/ If this enviro shift will lead to unprecedented levels of prosperity, why is it no private companies have attempted anything like this (even on a small scale)? Aren't they all greedy capitalists?
8/ About this crumbling infrastructure, will it all be demolished and new ones built, or is it geared towards massive renovations?
9/ What will happen to people who refuse to go along with it?

> Any large-scale transformation of society can create the risk of some people slipping through the cracks. That's why the Green New Deal also calls for an upgrade to the basic economic securities enjoyed by all people in the US to ensure everybody benefits from the newly created wealth. It guarantees to everyone:
> -A job with family-sustaining wages, family and medical leave, vacations, and retirement security
> -High-quality education, ***including higher education and trade schools***
> -High-quality health care
> -Clean air and water
> -Healthy food
> -Safe, affordable, adequate housing
> -An economic environment free of monopolies
> -Economic security to all who are unable or ***UNWILLING TO WORK***

(my emphasis above). That's right. It guarantees everyone "unwilling" to work economic security. Not those unable to work, but anyone "unwilling". This is doomed to fail, since there will be absolutely no incentive to work.

People will figure out very quickly it makes no sense to work and pay taxes for non-workers, when they can just be one of those non-workers, and get money for free. It will kill any incentive to be productive.

> "Why is such a large-scale mobilization necessary right now?
> A recent IPCC report declared that global temperatures must be kept below 1.5 degrees

> Celsius above preindustrial levels to ***avoid the most severe impacts of a changing climate.*** This calls for global reductions of greenhouse gas emissions of 40 to 60 percent by 2030. The U.S. contributes 20% of global emissions. To hit these global targets, the **US must not only get to a greenhouse gas emissions neutral society by 2030,** but it must also lead this change abroad to avert climate catastrophe."

1/ So it's not that the world will end in 12 years, but that there "may" be a rise of 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, (which was 1700s)
2/ IPCC has a very lengthy history of making wrong predictions. Does that matter to you?
3/ Also, if greenhouse emissions were such a critical factor, wouldn't all this industrialization you're calling for make the problem worse?
4/ Wouldn't planting a lot more trees take a lot of this impact away? Just hire poor highly-indebted college students.

> "How will you pay for the Green New Deal?
> The Green New Deal is a ***massive investment program, not an expenditure. The question isn't how will we pay for it, but what is the cost of inaction,*** and what will we do with our new shared prosperity created by the investments in the Green New Deal. We will finance the investments for the Green New Deal the same way we paid for the original New Deal, World War II, the bank bailouts, tax cuts for the rich, and decades of war – ***with public money appropriated by Congress.*** Further, government can take an equity stake in Green New Deal projects so the public gets a return on its investment. We already know that investments in infrastructure create huge returns on investment. The interstate highway system returned more than $6 in economic productivity for every $1 it cost. Similarly, investments in upgrading and transforming industry are a chance to grow the wealth of our nation dramatically."

This completely dodges the question. Leftists tend to refer to all spending as "investments" in order to deflect attention. No responsible government would simply commit to open-ended spending of this sort. The US is already $22 trillion (yes, trillion) in debt. Where would this money come from? And will people be "forced" to pay for and go along with this scheme?

The Huffington Post article echoes that mentality.

> "We must give up our obsession with trying to 'pay for' everything with new revenue or spending cuts."

"Will this hurt communities that rely on fossil fuels jobs?

The Green New Deal will prioritize creating high-quality, family wage-supporting union jobs in communities that rely on fossil fuel industries. It will ensure that all communities have a better alternative for high-wage work before they transition away from fossil fuel industry based work."

This is wishful thinking. Pumping almost endless amounts of money into an open-ended, and largely unquantifiable "World War II" agenda "may" lead to a job boom. But once the borrowed money runs out (hint: it will), it would lead to a regional collapse as those new jobs disappear.

> "Is this an environmental plan? Why do you have things like universal health care and other social safety net measures in here?
> The Green New Deal is a plan to make a **full-scale transition of our economy that puts jobs and justice first.** This plan will require a strong social safety net so that every U.S. person can make this transition comfortably and nobody falls through the cracks in the process. **If we want to be able to mobilize our economy fully, we can't afford to have employees stuck in their current jobs because they are afraid to lose health care or workers unable to participate because they can't afford the education and training programs**. We also need to be sure that workers currently employed in fossil fuel industries have higher-wage and better jobs available to them to be able to make this transition, and a federal jobs guarantee ensures that no worker is left behind. We believe that the economic securities and programs for justice and equity laid out in this Green New Deal resolution are a bare minimum of what we need to do to successfully execute the Green New Deal."

1/ So, this is to dismantle the US economy altogether and replace it with a new one?
2/ We can't afford to have people stuck in those low paying jobs, yet you are going to shut down entire industries.
3/ Your plan for a new infrastructure involves pumping money in indefinitely. Until these systems are operational, they won't be running, or able to produce anything else.

4/ This will involve creating a whole separate economy to build up all these new energy efficient systems, and overhauling existing buildings.
5/ Where will all this money come from? Wait, not supposed to ask.
6/ What will happen to transportation when all air travel is phased out?
7/ How does any of this "reduce" carbon emissions?
8/ Can we assume that "going along" with this plan will be voluntary? Or will it be forced?

Okay, now we get to the House Resolution itself, and the introduction of incessant identity politics.

First, here comes the fear mongering, and the costs of doing nothing. Take everything will a grain of salt.

> "(3) global warming at or above 2 degrees Celsius beyond preindustrialized levels will cause—
> (A) mass migration from the regions most affected by climate change;
> (B) more than $500,000,000,000 in lost annual economic output in the United States by the year 2100;
> (C) wildfires that, by 2050, will annually burn at least twice as much forest area in the western United States than was typically burned by wildfires in the years preceding 2019;
> (D) a loss of more than 99 percent of all coral reefs on Earth;
> (E) more than 350,000,000 more people to be exposed globally to deadly heat stress by 2050; and
> (F) a risk of damage to $1,000,000,000,000 of public infrastructure and coastal real estate in the United States; and
> (4) global temperatures must be kept below 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrialized levels to avoid the most severe impacts of a changing climate, which will require—
> (A) global reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from human sources of 40 to 60 percent from 2010 levels by 2030; and
> (B) net-zero global emissions by 2050;"

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez supports open borders and mass migration. She openly calls to abolish immigration control entirely in the US. So how will mass migration to a high-consumption society "reduce" carbon emissions?
B/ $500B in lost economic output, yet we are not supposed to ask about money when funding this new deal?

C/ A source would be nice.
D/ These are the same scientists who say the north pole would disappear.
E/ 350M more people exposed to heat stress? I thought temperatures were only going to raise 1.5 degrees Celcius?!
F/ A risk to $1 trillion worth of public infrastructure by a temperature raise of 1.5 degrees Celcius? And I thought money was no issue.
4/ "Pre-industrialised periods" means before 1800s.
A/ 40-60% cut? Yet you want to phase out carbon entirely.
B/ Plant more trees. Problem solved.

> "Whereas climate change, pollution, and environmental destruction have exacerbated systemic racial, regional, social, environmental, and economic injustices ***(referred to in this preamble as "systemic injustices")*** *by disproportionately affecting* ***indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth (referred to in this preamble as "frontline and vulnerable communities")***;"

The references to identity politics are rampant throughout the bill.

> "(2) a 4-decade trend of wage stagnation, deindustrialization, and antilabor policies that has led to—
> (A) ***hourly wages overall stagnating*** since the 1970s despite increased worker productivity;
> (B) the ***third-worst level of socioeconomic mobility*** in the developed world before the Great Recession;
> (C) the **erosion of the earning and bargaining power** of workers in the United States; and
> (D) inadequate resources for public sector workers to confront the challenges of climate change at local, State, and Federal levels; and"

It's an interesting double standard here. Ocasio-Cortez keeps ***bringing up*** wages, finances and economic situations when it comes to getting support for the bill. Yet she continuously **avoids** financial discussion when it comes for paying for this green new deal. Can't have it both ways.

> "(3) the greatest income inequality since the 1920s, with—
> (A) the top 1 percent of earners accruing 91 percent of gains in the first few years of economic recovery after the Great Recession;
> (B) a large racial wealth divide amounting to a difference of 20 times more wealth between the average white family and the average black family; and
> (C) a gender earnings gap that results in women earning approximately 80 percent as much as men, at the median;"

A/ Having an economic disparity by itself is not evidence of injustice. People who are highly driven tend to far out earn their unproductive counterparts. But remember, you wanted to create a system which paid people a living wage for **refusing** to work.
B/ Is this an apples-to-oranges comparison? Would Ocasio-Cortez be comparing European living standards to African living standards? Or is she suggesting this gap is all within America?
Remember, the 1% is very small.
So, if an average black family earned $30,000/year, does it mean the average white family earned $600,00/year? That doesn't add up
C/ The gender pay gap is simply the earnings difference between men and women overall. Women tend to earn less since they take more time off to raise children, and often choose lower paying jobs.

If you could get the same work from a woman as a man, and just pay her less, then wouldn't there be an incentive to fire all the men and only hire women?

> "(3) a Green New Deal must be developed **through transparent and inclusive consultation, collaboration, and partnership** with frontline and vulnerable communities, labor unions, worker cooperatives, civil society groups, academia, and businesses; and"

Sorry to rain on the parade, but what happens if large segments of these groups **DON'T** want the deal, and the burdens it imposes on them? Will their will be ignored?

Now, let's talk about how this will be implemented. Again, the Resolution doesn't take into account what will happen if people say no.

"(4) to achieve the Green New Deal goals and mobilization, a Green New Deal will require the following goals and projects—

(A) providing and leveraging, in a way that ensures that the public receives appropriate ownership stakes and returns on investment, adequate capital (including through community grants, public banks, and other public financing), technical expertise, supporting policies, and other forms of assistance to communities, organizations, Federal, State, and local government agencies, and businesses working on the Green New Deal mobilization;

(B) ensuring that the Federal Government takes into account the complete environmental and social costs and impacts of emissions through—

(i) existing laws;

(ii) new policies and programs; and

(iii) ensuring that **frontline and vulnerable communities** shall not be adversely affected;

(C) providing resources, training, and high-quality education, including higher education, to all people of the United States, with a focus on **frontline and vulnerable communities**, so that all people of the United States may be full and equal participants in the Green New Deal mobilization;

(D) making public investments in the research and development of new clean and renewable energy technologies and industries;

(E) directing investments to spur economic development, deepen and diversify industry and business in local and regional economies, and build wealth and community ownership, while prioritizing high-quality job creation and economic, social, and environmental benefits in **frontline and vulnerable communities**, and deindustrialized communities, that may otherwise struggle with the transition away from greenhouse gas intensive industries;

(F) ensuring the use of democratic and participatory processes that are inclusive of and led by **frontline and vulnerable** communities and workers to plan, implement, and administer the Green New Deal mobilization at the local level;

(G) ensuring that the Green New Deal mobilization creates high-quality union jobs that pay prevailing wages, hires local workers, offers training and advancement opportunities, and guarantees wage and benefit parity for workers affected by the transition;

(H) guaranteeing a job with a family-sustaining wage, adequate family and medical leave, paid vacations, and retirement security to all people of the United States;

(I) strengthening and protecting the right of all workers to organize, unionize, and

collectively bargain free of coercion, intimidation, and harassment;
(J) strengthening and enforcing labor, workplace health and safety, **antidiscrimination**, and wage and hour standards across all employers, industries, and sectors;
(K) enacting and enforcing trade rules, procurement standards, and border adjustments with strong labor and environmental protections—
(i) to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas; and
(ii) to grow domestic manufacturing in the United States;
(L) ensuring that public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and that eminent domain is not abused;
(M) obtaining the free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples for all decisions that affect indigenous peoples and their traditional territories, honoring all treaties and agreements with indigenous peoples, and protecting and enforcing the sovereignty and land rights of indigenous peoples;
(N) ensuring a commercial environment where every businessperson is free from unfair competition and domination by domestic or international monopolies; and
(O) providing all people of the United States with—
(i) high-quality health care;
(ii) affordable, safe, and adequate housing;
(iii) economic security; and
(iv) clean water, clean air, healthy and affordable food, and access to nature."

While this may be well intentioned, it is clearly not realistic
A/ Financing is important, but you need to provide "way" more detail on this.
B/ Take the societal impacts into account? Okay. What happens if your own studies say that your program is impractical?
C/ High education to everyone? Government controlled, or free market?
D/ Making investment in research? Okay, but how long will the research take to complete? Remember, this is only a 10 year plan
E/ Directing investments? Great, though again, we need more detail.
F/ Ensuring the democratic process? That "sounds" great, but this can only be achieved by "taking away" people's rights.
G/ Guaranteed jobs and training?
H/ More guaranteed jobs.
I/ Strengthening their rights, yet this deal can only be achieved by "removing" rights and imposing it.
J/ Strengthening H&S laws? Normally I would be totally on board with this, but it context of

everything else, it is chilling what the details will look like.
K/ This may be poor wording, but how does one "transfer pollution"? Also, why would you worry about borders? Don't you want to abolish ICE?
L/ Protecting public lands? Actually a good one.
M/ Consent from Indigenous Peoples? Okay, will you still go ahead if they say no?
N/ Prevent unfair competition? But don't you "ensure" it, with this government monopoly?
O/ Guaranteed health care, housing, jobs, necessities

While this all sounds great, the details (and lack of) are scary. Not only that, the authors seem totally unaware of how self-contradictory the GND is.

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez repeatedly **RELIES ON** financial incentives to sell the program, yet **AVOIDS** any talk of how this will be paid for.

Further she talks about *GIVING* rights and discretions to groups and how they run their lives, yet implementing this will require *TAKING* rights away.

The deal mentions EQUALITY many times, but entire sections are devoted to divisive IDENTITY POLITICS and to pandering to specific groups.

The Green New Deal is to **PROVIDE** new opportunities and entitlements for everyone in America, yet involves **SHUTTING DOWN** entire sectors of the economy.

All of these promises are made that the social service needs of *AMERICANS* will be met. However, Ocasio-Cortez promotes *OPEN BORDERS IMMIGRATION*, which would see those services overrun.

For this deal to be implemented in any real form, any and all rights of citizens (to oppose) it would need to be taken away, and the deal imposed by force. Even then, it would bankrupt the USA long before it ever became reality.

The new face of the Democratic Party?

CLICK HERE, for the Green New Deal FAQ.
CLICK HERE, for House Resolution 109, Green New Deal.
CLICK HERE, for the Forbes article referenced in the FAQ.
CLICK HERE, for the Huffington Post article referenced in the FAQ.

CLIMATE CHANGE SCAM, FREE SPEECH, US, VOTING PROCESS